

Remarks/Arguments

In view of the fact that allowable subject matter has been indicated to be present in the case, an earnest effort has been made to bring the application to issue without delay.

1. The Examiner's indication that claims 3-8, 12, 13, 16, 17 and 20 are allowable is appreciated. The allowable subject matter has also been introduced into claims 1 and 9 from which all other claims are dependent and it is therefore believed that all of claims 1-20 should now be considered to be allowable.

2. A new Abstract has been provided and is free from the informalities noted by the Examiner.

3. Claims 1, 2, 9 10, 14 and 18 have been rejected as anticipated by COCAIGN 2004.0075304. Claims 1 and 9 have been mounted to make clear that the frame surrounds a region of the roof or the body which is free from an opening. In COCAIGN, clearly the opening 102 precludes reading claim 1 on COCAIGN. The anticipation refection on COCAIGN must therefore fail.

4. Claims 9, 18 and 19 have been rejected as anticipated by DePAOLI, 2001/0030449. Claim 9 also specifies that a windowless part of th body lies within the frame. In DePAOLI, the entire point is to provide an escape hatch covered by the

window. DePAOLI does not provide a frame around a windowless part of the vehicle. The anticipation rejection on DePAOLI must also fail.

There is a rejection under 35 USC 102 on KOLLURI et al as well and again KOLLURI provides the structure shown "in a window opening in an automotive vehicle body structure" precluding an anticipation rejection.

Since none of the rejections applied to the claims as amended can stand, the claims in the case must be considered to be allowable.

5. The applicant has reviewed carefully all of the references cited and cannot see any basis for applying any of the references in the case. The references show replacement window systems covering actual openings, fixed units of various sorts and mechanisms of practically all types.


There is in the view of the inventor no basis for comparing any of these prior art systems with the invention and thus the claims in the case should be allowable.

Atty's 22772

Pat. App. 10/823,194

An early Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.



By: Herbert Dubno, Reg. No. 19,752
Attorney for Applicant

April 8, 2005
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: (718) 884-6600
Fax: (718) 601-1099